



City of Santa Barbara California

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: July 3, 2008
AGENDA DATE: July 10, 2008
PROJECT ADDRESS: 101 E. Victoria Street (MST2006-00758)

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Division, (805) 564-5470
 Jan Hubbell, AICP, Senior Planner *JH*
 Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner *KK*

I. INTRODUCTION

On May 22, 2008, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the project proposed at 101 E. Victoria Street (see Exhibit A - Staff Report). The Planning Commission approved the project with the following added conditions:

- consider providing loading spaces and other parking spaces south of the Anacapa driveway;
- consider a pedestrian bulb-out at the intersection of Victoria and Anacapa Streets;
- provide Condominium Association contact information to neighbors; and
- make allowances in construction for 13 additional parking lifts (in addition to the 3 lifts proposed by the applicant), monitor parking demand by independent monitor, subject to review by City Staff, and install additional parking lifts as necessary to meet demand.

On June 5, 2008, the Planning Commission voted to reconsider the approval of the proposed project. Chair Myers stated the following reasons for requesting the reconsideration: 1) The data presented by Staff and the subsequent questions and deliberation by the Planning Commission resulted in miscommunication and misunderstanding of the data; 2) The Commission did not have the opportunity to deliberate on the unintended consequences of its action when considering the environment and sustainability issues regarding the resources required to dig, construct, and haul the dirt away to accommodate the additional parking lifts, which would most likely never be installed or used; and 3) Considering the high likelihood that the decision would be appealed to the City Council, the Commission wants to make certain that it has fully studied and deliberated the policies, modifications, conditions, and ramifications pertaining to its decision.

II. PARKING MODIFICATION

During the Planning Commission discussion regarding the vote to reconsider, the Commissioners requested that Staff provide additional information regarding the parking modification at the

reconsideration hearing. The additional information provided by Transportation Planning Staff is presented below. Also, the applicant has submitted a letter addressing the parking modification (see Exhibit B – Applicant’s letter).

A. PARKING AND ITE’S PARKING GENERATION MANUAL

During the project review Staff received, reviewed, and approved the conclusion of the Parking Study prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE), dated September 12, 2007. Upon the Planning Commission’s concept review, some members stated that “...the parking demand study was not acceptable and (we) were not in support of the modification.” This sentiment was reiterated by one Commissioner at the May 22, 2008 Planning Commission hearing.

Staff uses tools such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Manual, currently in its 3rd edition, and the ITE Parking Handbook for Small Communities. Staff directed ATE to use the more conservative office parking demand rate provided in the Parking Generation Manual. This manual provides parking survey data for 91 land use categories, including Land Use 701 for Office Buildings which has an urban parking rate of 2.4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet (see Exhibit C – ITE Land Use). The manual’s land use description states:

ITE defines office uses in several categories. In reviewing the statistics for office parking demand, it was found that five of the basic office land uses had virtually no difference in parking demand characteristics.

The manual provides descriptions of the five different kinds office buildings: General Office, Corporate Headquarters, Single Tenant, Office Park, and Research and Development Center. The descriptions describe a range of buildings ranging from those that contain a mixture of tenants to single tenant buildings. As stated in the description above, building or occupancy type did not change the characteristic of parking demand. However, peak parking demand rates were different between study sites in suburban and urban settings. The manual states:

One potential explanation may relate to the differences in the availability of alternative modes (for example, transit, bike and pedestrian) available at urban sites. Of the studies with data on transit availability and presence of a TDM program, the suburban sites reported about 55 percent with available transit services and 20 percent with TDM programs. The urban sites reported 100 percent with available transit and 83 percent with TDM programs of some form.

Santa Barbara’s downtown area maintains a pedestrian friendly environment, a bus transit service including a downtown shuttle, bicycle corridors and a TDM program implemented by many employers mirroring the ITE urban rate description. City Staff directed ATE to use the urban rate category to determine the project’s average “peak period” parking demand. The parking demand was determined to be 37 parking spaces. Because the proposed project includes a total of 45 parking spaces, 8 of which are assigned to the adjacent property, and 37 spaces for the proposed project, the average peak parking demand would be met onsite.

B. SIMILAR SANTA BARBARA OFFICE PARKING CHARACTERISTICS

Penfield & Smith

Some Commissioners requested data regarding other downtown business offices including the Penfield & Smith (P&S) office building located at 109 E. Victoria Street. The P&S office received Planning Commission approval in July 2003 for a 17,075 square foot office building with a parking modification, to allow 39 spaces instead of 53, with a condition to implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. According to the P&S TDM manager, the existing 41 offices hold 62 employees, and approximately 15 employees (25%) use alternative transportation. Parking adequacy issues do occur at times for some low-tenured employees that do not have a designated space, and because of their personal circumstances have limited alternative transportation choices. The approved tandem spaces at the site work favorably through communication between the two drivers using the spaces.

Fithian Building

Staff performed a mid-morning, mid-week survey of employees at the Fithian Building located at the intersection of State and Ortega Streets, at 625 State Street. The Fithian Building contains approximately 9,800 square feet of separately leased offices on the second floor. Seventeen separate business offices were observed with a total of 31 employees. Seventeen employees commuted by motor vehicle (55%), while fourteen (45%) commuted via alternative transportation (5 walk, 8 bike, and 1 bus). It should be noted that 7 observed offices were vacant. Two were unoccupied without a lease and the other five office occupants were away from the building.

C. GRANADA GARAGE

In 1989, a study was prepared indicating that a parking deficit existed in the downtown area north of Carrillo Street, which eventually led to the construction of the Granada Garage in late 2005. The Granada Garage, along with the City's other downtown parking facilities, are a culmination of the strategy developed by the Downtown Organization, in cooperation with the City, to create a parking district that provides convenient parking access between Chapala and Anacapa Streets for the customers of downtown merchants. It is important to distinguish that the parking provided by the 12 City lots is for customers and not parking for residents or employees. Protecting this customer parking resource is crucial to preserving the City's downtown economic vitality.

The Granada Garage continues to see increasing occupancy rates but continues to sell a maximum of 100 (40 to County of Santa Barbara) parking passes at a cost of \$150 per month to nearby businesses and employees. The parking district provides ample customer parking, while at the same time discouraging employee use because of its hourly costs.

D. PARKING AND BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREA (PBIA) AND PARKING ZONE OF BENEFIT (ZOB)

The Parking and Business Improvement Area (PBIA) is a downtown area where business owners are charged a parking assessment. It was established so that businesses could maintain

a competitive parking program with other nearby business owners who provide free parking. Competitive parking is accomplished by the City providing 75-minute free parking and low hourly rates for customers. The assessment pays for a portion of the 75-minute free period and is used to partially pay the kiosk operators' salaries and utility costs at City lots. All businesses located within the PBIA boundary and within approximately 650 feet of a City lot are required to pay the assessment. The parking assessment fee owed by each business varies. The City developed nine business rate categories. Each category has a formula to determine a rate. The rate is then multiplied by a "Zone of Benefit" (ZOB) percentage, determined by the walking distance between the business and the closest City parking lot. Businesses adjacent to parking facilities are in a 100% ZOB and therefore, are exempt from providing on-site parking. If a business provides on-site parking, a patron parking credit factor is also applied. Due to the location of the 101 E. Victoria Street site in relation to the Granada Garage, the designated 20% ZOB results in a reduction of the amount of parking required under zoning by 20%.

E. UNBUNDLED PARKING

Commissioners have inquired about parking requirement options and the ability to separate the payment component of parking from the rest of a project. Donald Shoup, in his book, The High Cost of Free Parking, describes the advantage of unbundled parking over included parking for residential condominiums:

Developers can offer the option to buy parking spaces separately from the condominium association rather than buy them. Under the first option, the market would reveal how much residents value the parking spaces, and developers could cease building spaces residents do not think are worth the construction and maintenance costs. Under the second option, the association could own the parking spaces as common property and lease them to the residents at a price that equates demand and supply. The rent from the common owned parking spaces could then replace all or part of the association fees residents pay to maintain their association. Parking wouldn't be free, but those who own fewer cars would pay less. After unbundling, developers would find they could build condominiums with fewer parking spaces because residents would want fewer cars when they pay for parking separately.

Commercial condominiums would work similarly. The City of Santa Barbara may consider an unbundling policy as part of an innovative approach to decrease traffic impacts as part of Plan Santa Barbara. If it were to be incorporated now as part of parking modification requests, depending on a project's location, prices associated with unbundled parking will be influenced by the surrounding free parking supply. In areas where free or low-cost parking is readily available, that supply would limit the price that an unbundled space would command.

F. TRAFFIC AND PARKING POLICY

The Circulation Element (CE) of the General Plan provides goals and policies to address traffic congestion. Chapter 7 points to the creation of a Parking Master Plan to coordinate and manage parking in the City. The Parking Master Plan would then outline strategies and implementation measures for addressing the City's parking supply, residential parking permit

program, and parking requirements and design standards. The guiding parking policy of the Parking Master Plan is to optimize parking resources and to encourage increased use of alternative modes. Some suggested measures include:

- Innovative parking design, such as tandem or stacked parking
- Reduced on-site parking requirements that support alternative modes of transportation
- Reduced parking for delivery services
- Parking pricing as a way to discourage drive-alone trips

Studies show that, if parking or travel is costly or unavailable, drivers will be more inclined to adapt their behavior and seek other forms of transportation to and from work. For most of the age of the automobile, inexpensive fuel and free readily available parking have not required driver behavior to be tested unless adverse costs are introduced. Today, drivers are realizing high gas prices, and recent data from organizations such as CalTrans and MTD support the fruition of driver adaptation, by showing that overall vehicle mileage is down while bus ridership rates are up.

In his book, The High Cost of Free Parking, Donald Shoup makes the parking and travel demand connection by stating:

Parking spaces do not create travel demand, of course, but a larger supply of parking reduces its market price and therefore reduces the price of vehicle travel. In the short run, the lower prices induce those who were already driving to drive even more. Some who would have stayed home begin driving. And some who would otherwise walk, cycle, or ride public transit shift to driving. In the long run, the lower price of parking leads to increased vehicle ownership and thus further increases in vehicle travel. Parking spaces do not create vehicle travel but they do enable it.

Mr. Shoup states that free and abundant on and off-street parking facilitates vehicle travel similar to the cheap fuels effect. Similarly, regulations that encourage ample free parking at levels greater than needed enable vehicle travel and reduce the use of alternative modes. As was shown above in the two Santa Barbara examples, not all drivers will opt out of their vehicles, but many will, which leads to a more efficient transportation system for all mode users.

G. CONCLUSION

Transportation and parking policy will continue to play an important role in the sustainable health and vitality of Santa Barbara. Until the Parking Master Plan is completed, the modification process is the tool available to implement some of the existing goals and policies.

Using ITE parking data, Transportation Staff continues to support the conclusions provided by the ATE analysis, and finds the proposed office use is similar in character to that found in other downtown offices that provide less parking than today's zoning requirements. Transportation Staff supports the modification of the zoning code parking requirement, and the provision of parking that meets average peak demand.

III. OTHER ISSUES

After the project was approved by the Planning Commission on May 22, 2008, an appeal by the neighbors was filed. Although the appeal is currently on hold given the reconsideration hearing, some of the appeal issues are addressed below.

A. CONFERENCE ROOM

The applicant has submitted revised drawings that address a number of the concerns that were expressed by the Arlington Court neighbors regarding the second floor conference room and outdoor patio that was proposed adjacent to their condominium development. The new drawings clearly show that the roof of the conference room would extend only minimally above the existing 14 foot high wall. Over half of the outdoor patio area has been eliminated from its previous location along the property line and has been replaced with a green roof. In addition, the restrooms which previously faced the adjacent property have been relocated to the interior of the site.

B. NOISE

The neighbors have expressed a concern that the noise resulting from the operation of the parking lifts would disrupt the employees at the project site as well as the surrounding neighbors. In response to this concern, the applicant has submitted a report from the manufacturer that shows that the noise resulting from the raising of the lift platform would be 56-58 dBA (see Exhibit D – Sound Measurements). This sound level was measured at the key switch, which in the case of the proposed project would be underground, around the corner from the driveway and a substantial distance from the neighbors. At this location, the sound level is less than the noise threshold for private outdoor living areas (60 dBA) and, therefore, it would not have a negative impact on the outdoor living spaces of the neighbors in the vicinity. In regard to the effect on the employees at the project site, the proposed project must conform to the building code requirement that offices have a maximum interior exposure of 50 dBA due to exterior sources.

C. REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The conditions of approval have been revised to reflect the motion that was made for approval of the project on May 22, 2008. The condition regarding the construction of the pits for 13 additional parking lifts has not been added because Staff believes the condition may be subject to substantial revision on reconsideration.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

With approval of the parking modification, the proposed project conforms to the City's Zoning and Building Ordinances, and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the size and massing of the project are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project, making the findings outlined in the attached Staff report, and subject to the revised conditions of approval in Exhibit E, and forward the project to the City Council with a recommendation for approval of the Final Economic Development Designation.

Planning Commission Staff Report
101 E. Victoria Street (MST2006-00758)
July 10, 2008
Page 7

Exhibits:

- A. Planning Commission Staff Report for May 22, 2008 (w/o exhibits)
- B. Applicant's letter, dated June 20, 2008
- C. ITE Land Use Description
- D. Report of Sound Meter Measurements
- E. Revised Conditions of Approval

H:\Group Folders\PLAN\PC Staff Reports\2008 Reports\2008-07-10_Item_III_-_101 E. Victoria St Report.doc

Brownstein | Hyatt
Farber | Schreck

*A Strategic
California Merger
with Hatch & Parent*

June 20, 2008

Chair Myers and Members of the Planning Commission
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Eva A. Turenchalk, AICP
Land Use Planner
805.882.1436 tel
805.965.4333 fax
eturenchalk@bhfs.com

RE: Condominium Office Project
101 E. Victoria Street, APN: 029-071-013

Dear Chair Myers and Members of the Planning Commission:

Our office represents 101 East Victoria, LLC, applicants for the condominium office project on Victoria Street. We, along with our clients, would like to express our appreciation for the reconsideration of your Commission's vote on the proposed parking modification for this project.

As we've presented in previous hearings and letters, this project has been designed with a goal of achieving a Silver LEED® Certification, and the concept of sustainability is very important to our clients. We feel strongly that if this City is going to move towards sustainability we need to work on not centering projects around the use of the automobile. In this instance, we would meet our parking demand as presented by Scott Schell of Associated Transportation Engineers, and verified by City Transportation staff. We are simply asking for a parking modification so that the project does not end up over-parked solely to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Our parking demand study was prepared based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual, a manual used in virtually all traffic and parking calculations in the City and in surrounding jurisdictions. The ITE manual states that the five basic office uses (General Office, Corporate Headquarters, Single-Tenant Office, Office Park and Research and Development) have virtually no difference in parking demand. Within these uses, General Office Building is described as a building housing multiple tenants, which we feel is an appropriate definition of our proposed building.

We understand that some Commissioners have concerns that applying standard parking calculations may not be sufficient for this project given that we've been focusing on the unique character of our proposal. We would like to clarify that the uniqueness of our project is not in the multi-tenant design, it is in the fact that these offices will be available for sale. There are several instances of small multi-tenant buildings in Santa Barbara.

In addition to meeting our actual parking demand as calculated by ATE, there are several additional reasons why we believe the proposed 37 parking spaces would adequately serve the proposed project:

- The project is located just outside the Central Business District (CBD) zone, whose boundary is just across the street from the project on Victoria. The CBD reduces the parking demand from 1 space per 250 sf. to 1 space per 500 sf. The recently constructed Penfield and Smith Building, which is a few doors down and on the same side of Victoria as this project site, was granted a parking modification based on its proximity to the CBD. If the CBD reduction were to be applied to this project as it was to the P&S project, the 101 East project would only

21 East Carrillo Street | Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2706
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP

805.963.7000 tel
805.965.4333 fax

EXHIBIT B


be required to provide 25 parking spaces. Our understanding is that the parking situation at the Penfield and Smith Building has been working well for the users and the neighbors.

- The Zone of Benefit has not been adjusted to account for the new Granada Garage. An increase in the Zone of Benefit would likely result in the project fully meeting its parking requirement per the Zoning Ordinance. While Staff has clarified that the zone won't technically be adjusted in this area, we believe that, due to its close proximity, the reality is that the Granada Garage will benefit this site.
- The proposed project is not likely to be fully occupied all day. These will be individual offices owned by sole practitioners looking for some office or meeting space in the downtown area. Our experience with similar buildings (such as the Fithian building) suggests that occupancy of the project will likely be staggered throughout the day, and thus it is very unlikely that all of the offices will be occupied at any given time.
- The project will be providing bicycle parking as well as a locker room with showers to facilitate the use of alternative transportation for the building occupants.

Given all of this information, we continue to feel strongly that the 37 spaces we are proposing for the project will fully satisfy the parking demand. We encourage you to vote that projects should not be overparked, particularly in the downtown area, so as to encourage and incentivize the use of alternative transportation.

We continue to see this project as very beneficial to the City in many ways, and hope you concur in this assessment. Should you have any questions as you review this proposal, please do not hesitate to contact me. We look forward to working with you towards the successful completion of this project.

Sincerely,



Eva A. Turenchalk, AICP
LEED® Accredited Professional

Land Use: 701 Office Building

Land Use Description

ITE defines office uses in several categories. In reviewing the statistics for office parking demand, it was found that five of the basic office land uses had virtually no difference in parking demand characteristics. The following section merges these uses together for analysis purposes. ***Analysts should continue to record the specific ITE land use category for data that they submit.***

710: General Office Building—A general office building houses multiple tenants; it is a location where affairs of businesses, commercial or industrial organizations, or professional persons or firms are conducted. An office building or buildings may contain a mixture of tenants including professional services; insurance companies; investment brokers; and tenant services, such as a bank or savings and loan institution, a restaurant or cafeteria and service retail facilities. Corporate headquarters (Land Use 714), single tenant office building (Land Use 715), office park (Land Use 750) and research and development center (Land Use 760) are related uses.

714: Corporate Headquarters Building—A corporate headquarters building is a single tenant office building that houses the corporate headquarters of a company or organization, which generally consists of offices, meeting rooms, space for file storage and data processing, a restaurant or cafeteria and other service functions. General office building (Land Use 710), single tenant office building (Land Use 715), office park (Land Use 750) and research and development center (Land Use 760) are related uses.

715: Single Tenant Office Building—A single tenant office building generally contains offices, meeting rooms and space for file storage and data processing for a single business or company, and possibly other service functions, including a restaurant or cafeteria. General office building (Land Use 710), corporate headquarters building (Land Use 714), office park (Land Use 750) and research and development center (Land Use 760) are related uses.

750: Office Park—Office parks are usually suburban subdivisions or planned unit developments containing general office buildings and support services, such as banks, restaurants and service stations, arranged in a park- or campus-like atmosphere. General office building (Land Use 710), corporate headquarters building (Land Use 714), single tenant office building (Land Use 715) and research and development center (Land Use 760) are related uses.

760: Research and Development Center—Research and development centers are facilities or groups of facilities devoted almost exclusively to research and development activities. The range of specific types of businesses contained in this land use varies significantly. Research and development centers may contain offices and light fabrication areas. General office building (Land Use 710), corporate headquarters building (Land Use 714), single tenant office building (Land Use 715) and office park (Land Use 750) are related uses.

Database Description

The database consisted of a mix of suburban and urban sites. Parking demand differed between the area types for one independent variable (1,000 sq. ft. GFA) but not for another (employees). Therefore, parking demand was analyzed separately for 1,000 sq. ft. and was combined for employees.

- Average parking supply ratios: 4.0 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA (84 study sites) and 1.1 spaces per employee (48 study sites).
- Average employee density: 3.3 employees per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA (54 study sites). Employee densities for corporate headquarter buildings and research and development centers tended to be slightly lower than the average.

One Commissioner would want to see a good effort made on the landscaping given the significance of maintaining the services in this neighborhood of Santa Barbara. Does not want to set a standard that is lower than what would be used on other neighborhoods.

Mr. Orosz thinks that the project can be evaluated and would like to come back to address the landscaping and pedestrian issues.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

Chair Myers called a recess at 3:01 P.M. and resumed the meeting at 3:18 P.M.

IV. RECONSIDERED ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 3:18 P.M.

APPLICATION OF CEARNAL ANDRULAITIS LLP, ARCHITECT FOR SCHAAR HOMES, 101 E. VICTORIA STREET, APN 029-071-013, C-2, COMMERCIAL ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OFFICE AND MAJOR PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL (MST2006-00758)

This is a hearing to reconsider the proposed project that was approved by the Planning Commission on May 22, 2008. The project consists of a proposal to demolish an existing two-story 11,900 square foot commercial office building and construct a new three-story 17,607 square foot commercial building comprised of 50 condominium office units on a 19,725 square foot parcel. A total of forty-five parking spaces would be provided in an underground garage, with eight reserved for the adjacent parcel located at 109 E. Victoria Street.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification of the parking requirements to allow less than the number of required parking spaces (SBMC§28.90);
2. Tentative Subdivision Map to create a one-lot subdivision for 50 commercial condominium units (SBMC§27.07);
3. Development Plan approval to allow 5,707 square feet of additional non-residential development (SBMC§28.87.300); and
4. Preliminary Economic Development Determination (SBMC28.87.300).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15332 (In-fill Development Project).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
Email: kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

RECUSALS: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest Commissioner Jacobs recused herself due to the attorney representing the project working at the same firm as her husband.

EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:

All Commissioners disclosed that they have had no ex parte communication outside of individual questions to Staff.

Chair Myers recapped the reasons for the reconsideration request.

Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney, stated that a reconsideration would mean that the Commission's prior action did not occur and that the project would be brought back to where it was at the prior meeting just before making a decision.

Commissioner Jostes was not at the initial meeting and abstained from the reconsideration vote, but did review the video and felt informed enough to participate in a decision on the project today.

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation, joined by Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner.

Staff clarified the Planning Commission's questions about parking.

Brian Cearnal, Cearnal Andrulaitis Architects, gave the applicant presentation.

Mr. Cearnal answered the Planning Commission questions, stating that the amount of additional excavation for the additional parking lift pits would be 620 cubic yards; and clarified that the parking easement with the adjacent lot is a permanent ingress/egress easement.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 3:42 P.M.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project or with concerns:

1. Patricia Hiles remained concerned about inadequate parking and lack of off-street parking. Feels that the project should bear the burden of its own parking needs. There is no environmental review that has been done on this project. Would like to see entrance moved to Victoria Street. There are already a number of small commercial buildings that exist in the community. Disagreed with position taken in letter written by Joe Andrulaitis.
2. Robert Chyla acknowledged a positive experience in meeting with Mr. Cearnal, feels some issues, including hazardous waste, loading zones and the conference room location have been resolved. Would like the status of the relocation request made for units 44 and 45.

3. Len Kaplan, Arlington Court, remains concerned with how delivery trucks will be handled. Believes that units 44 and 45 block the view to the Courthouse and would like them relocated to mitigate the view loss.

The following people made general comments:

1. Jessica Cesaroni, President, Arlington Court Owners Association, thanked Mr. Cearnal for attending a home owners meeting and addressing the concerns of the Association.
2. Sally Tannenbaum, Arlington Court Owners Association, is concerned with the potential for accidents that could result from the ingress/egress location. Would like to see a condition of approval included to restrict the conference room hours of use

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:52 P.M.

Mr. Cearnal addressed the Commission and provided a status on the soils clean up stating that the monitoring was approved to stop and would be retested in 30 days; efforts made on the red curb and loading zones with the City Transportation Staff; addressed the potential relocation of units 44 and 45, but also reminded the Commission that the issue involves private views that do not fall under the purview of the Commission; and agreed to adding a condition for the conference room hours of operation.

Mr. Cearnal answered the Planning Commission's questions about reduction of the parking footprint if parking is reduced and the inability to replace the area with landscaping; and stated a strong preference to keep all proposed units.

Commissioner's comments:

1. One Commissioner remains concerned with the driveway access off of Anacapa Street and prefers Victoria Street, yet respects Transportation Staff's analysis of access off of Victoria Street presenting more traffic issues. Believes that we need to add adequate freight loading and unloading, but does not have a solution and defers to Transportation Staff.
2. Two Commissioners would like to condition that conference room not be used between 8 pm – 8 a.m. Another Commissioner did not feel the condition was necessary and wanted to see more flexibility in the condition.
3. If the parking modification is approved, would like to condition a parking demand utilization study be conducted for one to three years after the units are occupied, including the lifts.
4. Commissioners appreciated the project being reconsidered and the cooperation extended to the neighbors.
5. One Commissioner feels confident about the parking given the close proximity to the Granada Garage and would like to remove the condition requiring the additional parking pits.

6. One Commissioner remains solidly behind the project providing one parking space per unit. Feels that, although it is not in the purview of the Commission to protect private views, collaboration should move forward for the preservation of the public views.
7. One Commissioner supports the project's unique contribution of small offices to the community. Would like to see the approval of the parking modification provide more landscaped open space on site ; cites Meridian Studios as comparable design of the single-story component for inspiration. Further stated that the building height is appropriate and there are no size, bulk and scale issues.
8. One Commissioner said there would be an opportunity for project tenants to buy into the Granada Garage, if parking needs were not met in the short-term and acknowledge the shift away from single-occupancy vehicles.
9. Would like to see space in the parking garage to get more trees to the soil below the parking. This would enhance the landscaping by allowing for larger trees.
10. One Commissioner stated support for the project as proposed without additional parking lifts and stated that the conference room condition was not needed.

Staff responded to additional Planning Commission questions about maintaining the pedestrian bulb-out in the conditions as a consideration, not a requirement, and explained how the Parking Business Improvement Area works.

MOTION: Bartlett/Larson

Assigned Resolution No. 026-08

Approve the project with the findings in the Staff Report, subject to the Conditions of Approval and forward to the City Council with a recommendation for approval of the Final Economic Development Designation, with additional conditions: 1) Parking usage shall be monitored by an independent monitoring service for 2 years from Certificate of Occupancy and include the effectiveness of the parking lifts. If monitoring reveals insufficient parking to meet demand, owners shall take action to resolve the problem, which will require monitoring to continue until the parking demand imbalance is resolved; 2) Historic Landmarks Committee (HLC) shall consider alternate locations for units 44 and 45 to increase private view opportunities for the adjacent neighbors; 3) HLC shall consider ways to increase in-dirt landscaping opportunities on site; and 4) Historic Landmarks Committee shall consider ways to increase on-site storage for tenants.

Mr. Vincent addressed the Commission's parking concern by citing the Fithian Building's lack of parking onsite and noted how the tenants have found their own solutions and suggested the same could occur here.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (White) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jacobs)

Chair Myers announced the ten calendar day appeal period.